

Roy A. Combs, SBN 123507
rcombs@fagenfriedman.com
Joshua A. Stevens, SBN 228239
jstevens@fagenfriedman.com
FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST, LLP
70 Washington Street, Suite 205
Oakland, California 94607
Phone: 510-550-8200
Fax: 510-550-8211

Attorneys for Defendants PITTSBURG
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, BARBARA
WILSON AND PERCY MCGEE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TIM GALLI,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT, BARBARA WILSON AND
PERCY MCGEE,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:09-cv-03775-JSW

**JOINT STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
PROTECTIVE ORDER REGARDING
CERTAIN DEPOSITION TESTIMONY**

Trial Date: May 9, 2011

**THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE AND REQUEST ENTRY OF THE
FOLLOWING PROTECTIVE ORDER:**

1. Plaintiff has noticed the deposition of Joe Arenivar, a member of the Board of Education of Defendant Pittsburg Unified School District.

2. Plaintiff, through his counsel, intends to inquire into subject matters that may call for testimony about events occurring during closed session and subject to confidentiality under the Ralph M. Brown Act under California Government Code Section 54950 *et seq.*

3. The Parties have meet and conferred regarding the scope of this examination and as a result of this meet and confer the parties agree that Plaintiff may examine Trustee Arenivar and Percy McGee on subjects discussed in closed session of the Pittsburg Unified School District that

are relevant to Tim Galli and this litigation and are not otherwise privileged, and that any such examination and testimony, including but expressly not limited to any transcripts thereof, shall remain confidential and subject to protective order, shall only be used in this action and any appellate proceedings that might follow from this action, and shall not be disclosed to any third person (except in a hearing or proceeding in this action) without written consent of the District or Court order.

4. Plaintiff has also noticed a second deposition of Defendants Percy McGee and Barbara Wilson, set to occur on Friday, September 3, 2010.

5. Plaintiff, through his counsel, intends to inquire into the subject matter(s) raised by Mr. McGee's correction of his April 22, 2010 deposition testimony at page 64, lines 14 and 16.

6. The parties have met and conferred over the dispute regarding the scope of examination triggered by the above correction, including the scope of personal financial information that Mr. McGee may disclose given his duties and obligations to maintain client confidentiality under Federal Security & Exchange regulations applicable to Mr. McGee.

7. The Parties have agreed, as a result of these meet and confer discussions, that Mr. McGee may testify, to the extent of his knowledge, as to RGM and/or Ralph Caputo as to the following:

- a. The existence, formation, and McGee's participation in the Gallo Group
- b. The number of accounts within Merrill Lynch and/or The Gallo Group to his knowledge;
- c. The solicitation for business or other acquisition of business of RGM and/or Caputo.
- d. The date such accounts were opened and/or closed within Merrill Lynch to his knowledge;
- e. The date(s) he managed any of those accounts and the dates he ceased to managed any of those accounts, and why the accounts ceased (if they did);
- f. McGee's earnings from the accounts and the nature of those earnings (flat rate, commissions, origination fees, etc.).
- g. The impact on McGee's commissions from the loss of RGM and/or Caputo and/or

Wilson's accounts, if any, either managed by McGee or elsewhere within Merrill Lynch

h. The parties agree that the examination and testimony, including but expressly not limited to any transcripts thereof, shall remain confidential and subject to protective order, shall only be used in this action and any appellate proceedings that might follow from this action, and shall not be disclosed to any third person (except in a hearing or proceeding in this action) without written consent of the District or Court order

8. By this stipulation, no party waives their right to assert or challenge any other privilege, protection or objection in deposition. Nor does any party waive any right to pursue or seek enforcement of this stipulation or protective order upon entry by the Court.

9. All parties acknowledge the Court has the authority to fully enforce this stipulation, and protective order, including the authority to impose sanctions in the event of a breach by any party.

SO STIPULATED.

DATED: September 3, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST, LLP

By:

Roy A. Combs

Attorneys for Defendants PITTSBURG UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT, BARBARA WILSON
AND PERCY MCGEE

DATED: September 3, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW GROUP, P.C.

By:

David Scher

Attorneys for Plaintiff TIM GALLI

Fagen Friedman & Fulfrost, LLP

70 Washington Street, Suite 205

Oakland, California 94607

Main: 510-550-8200 • Fax: 510-550-8211

[PROPOSED] ORDER

THE COURT HEREBY ACCEPTS THIS STIPULATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH
ITS TERMS

DATED: September 7, 2010


Hon. Jeffrey S. White
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

00254.00140/221443.1

Fagen Friedman & Fulfroft, LLP
70 Washington Street, Suite 205
Oakland, California 94607
Main: 510-550-8200 • Fax: 510-550-8211